



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON A NEW ARGIVE INSCRIPTION

Bull. Corr. Hell. XXXIV (1910), 331 ff.

An important fifth-century inscription of Argos, found in 1906, is published for the first time by Vollgraff in the last number of the *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*. The editor accompanies the text with a translation and an exhaustive commentary which are in most respects admirable. But exception must certainly be taken to the punctuation and interpretation of ll. 3-6, which he reads and translates as follows:¹ *χρέματα δὲ μὲ ὕπιπα-σκέσθῃ ὁ Κνόςσιω[s] ἐν Τυλισσοῖ, ὁ δὲ Τυλίσιος ἐν Κνοσσοῖ. ὁ χρέιζ[ὸν] μὲδὲ χόρας ἀποτάμνεσθαι μὲδατέρους μὲδ' ἄ[π]ανσαν ἀφαιρῖσθαι*, "Les Knossiens ne pourront acquérir de biens à Tyllissos, ni inversement les Tyllissiens à Knossos. Les créanciers ne pourront enlever tout ou partie ni aux uns ni aux autres." This interpretation involves four serious difficulties: (1) the absence of a negative before *Τυλίσιος*, (2) the construction *χρέιζ[ὸν] . . . ἀποτάμνεσθαι*, (3) an unknown use of *χρήζω*, (4) the accusative *μὲδατέρους* translated as if it were a genitive or a dative of interest. Upon the first point the editor makes no comment. But surely *μὲδέ* is required to justify the translation "ni inversement les Tyllissiens," whereas the clause as it stands with *δέ* can only denote a contrast to the preceding prohibition. Upon the second and third points the editor comments as follows (p. 350): "Il y a ici confusion entre deux constructions également bonnes: *ὁ χρέιζον . . . ἀποταμνέσθῃ*, et: *τὸν χρέιζοντα . . . ἀποτάμνεσθαι*." "*Χρήζω* signifie généralement: *avoir besoin de, désirer*, quelquefois: *rendre un oracle*. Je ne connais pas d'autre texte où il ait, comme c'est le cas ici, la signification de prêter. On sait que, pour rendre ce dernier sens, les Grecs se servaient couramment du présent *κίχρημι*."

All these difficulties are removed by a simple change in the editor's punctuation. The first sentence ends, not with *Τυλισσοῖ*, but with *χρέιζ[ὸν]*, and means: "The Cnossian may not acquire property in Tyllissos, but the Tyllissian may do so in Cnossos if he wishes." Of the two Cretan cities in question (with whose relations to each other and to Argos this Argive inscription deals), Tyllissos was of course the weaker and was protected against the aggrandizement of Cnossian capitalists, just as the allies of Athens were protected by a similar prohibition of acquisition of their property by Athenians. Cf. Dittenberger *Sylloge*, No. 80, ll. 35 ff., aptly quoted by the editor, p. 338, with whose comments our translation accords better than his own. For Cnossos had no need of such protection, and so it is expressly stated that any Tyllissian who wished (*ὁ χρέιζον = ὁ βουλόμενος*, as often) might acquire property in Cnossos. The second sentence is also now in order, *μὲδατέρους* being of course the subject of the infinitives: "Neither party shall seize a part of the land or appropriate it all."

I add a few minor comments. *κέλ Λευκόπορον*, l. 8, the editor says is for *καὶ ἐν Λευκόπορον*, comparing *ἐλ (= ἐν) Λακεδαίμονι*, *IG. IV*, 952. In the

¹ I change the editor's style of transcription to the extent of inserting the macron over *ε* and *ο* where they stand for long vowels.

Argive dialect it must stand rather for καὶ ἐ(ν)ς Λευκόπορον, to be compared with Lac. ἐλ Λακεδαίμονα, Att. τὸλ λίθως, Cret. τοῖλ λείονσι, etc.

In l. 9 we read 'ἴ κα τοῖ Μαχανεῖ θύομεν τὸνς ρεξέκοντα τελέονς ὄφινς, "whenever we sacrifice the sixty wethers to Zeus Machaneus." The editor remarks, p. 351, "Le mot 'ἴ est nouveau. Il ne s'est rencontré, jusqu' ici, ni dans les auteurs ni dans les textes épigraphiques." He quotes two other hitherto unpublished inscriptions of Argos in which the same form occurs, but with locative force "where," and rightly concludes that the temporal use is secondary. He explains the form as an old locative of ὄς, and parallels ἴ, ὄς, ὄθι, with ἄγχι, ἄγχοῦ, ἄγχόθι. But ἄγχι, from which ἄγχοῦ, ἄγχόθι are formed after the analogy of o-stem forms like ὄς, ὄθι, etc., is certainly not itself an o-stem locative, nor is it possible so to explain ἴ, if this is understood as representing a form with inherited ι-vowel. This new ἴ is nothing more nor less than the well-known West Greek εἰ in a spelling which is indeed surprising in so early an inscription, of any other dialect than Boeotian, but which ἀφαιρῖσθαι, l. 6, = Att. ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, though this of course is not a case of a genuine diphthong, sufficiently justifies us in recognizing. In later Argolic inscriptions we find καλῖσθαι, Δινία, Κλινάγορον, Τισικράτεος, etc. See Hoffmann, in *SGDI*. IV, 427. Why this spelling was especially persistent in the case of ἴ, which in the later inscriptions quoted by Vollgraff occurs three times, although ε appears in other words, as ἀποδείξει, Λυκείου, εἰκόνι, I do not pretend to explain. But the identity of this ἴ with εἰ appears to me inevitable.

The inscription exhibits the characteristics to be expected in Argolic, such as, not to mention general Doric features, νσ in ἐνς, τόνς, ἄ[π]ανσαν, etc., ἱαρός with lenis (but also ἄ[π]ανσαν!), ποί, ἀλιαίαι, ἀφρέτευε. For the first time ὄς = Lat. *ovis*, Skt. *avis*, etc., is quotable with its original ρ, namely acc. pl. ὄφινς, l. 10. Note also ὅπνι 'whither' like Cret. ὅπνι (ὄς was already known in Argolic), πρεσγέαν with πρεσ- as in Attic but γ as in Boeot. πρισγείες, Cret. πρέγνς, etc., and especially οὔτο l. 14 = τοῦτο, as in Boeotian. But the most interesting form is the third plural imperative middle πογγραφάνσθῳ, l. 26, on account of its bearing upon a question which is discussed in Kühner-Blass *Griech. Gram.* II, p. 62, and Brugmann *Griech. Gram.*³, p. 344, footnote, and is referred to briefly in my *Greek Dialects*, p. 106, § 140, 3b. After citing Epid. φερῶσθῳ, Lac. ἀνελσθῳ, Heracl. ἐπελάσθῳ, as coming from -νσθῳ (formed of course after the analogy of the active -ντω) with the same loss of ν without vowel lengthening as is regular in the case of inherited νσ + consonant (§ 77.2), I add "But Corcyr. ἐκλογ-ζούσθῳ comes from -ονσθῳ of later origin and with later treatment of νσ, (77.3, 78), and it is possible to read φερῶσθῳ, etc., likewise early Att. -ῶσθῳ." Now that Arg. πογγραφάνσθῳ ranges itself beside Corcyr. ἐκλογ-ζούσθῳ, the probability that the same history is to be assumed for the other forms is greatly increased and I should now definitely prefer the latter view.

CARL D. BUCK